

## R E M A R K S

Claims 13-15 currently remain in the application. Claims 1-12 and 16-18 have been canceled and claim 13 is herein amended.

The matter of double patenting in Paragraph 1 in page 2 of the Official Letter is a moot point because claims 16 and 17 are herein canceled.

The matter in Paragraph 2 in page 2 of the Official Letter is addressed to by filing a set of formal drawings.

Claim 13 is herein amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 16, although the Examiner has rejected claim 16 over Cowman in view of Matsuoka and Mahoney.

Cowman was correctly characterized by the Examiner as failing to disclose the material for the oxide that is mixed. Matsuoka was cited evidently for disclosing the formation of conductive terminals by electrolysis, describing a high resistance layer 11 formed by applying a paste containing  $SiO_2$ ,  $Sb_2O_3$  or  $In_2O_3$  to  $Bi_2O_3$  (column 3, lines 4-26 and column 4, lines 17-42) but there is no description of the composition of the high resistance layer of claim 16 herein (now incorporated into claim 13). Mahoney was cited probably for describing thermistor elements comprising Mn, Ni, Co, Fe, Cu and Al. A resistive film 13 made of an insulating material, a resistive material or a dielectric material is also described as being formed on the surface of such an element but there is no specific description of any example of an insulating or resistive material. It is only DuPont Dielectric Composition 5704 (column 3, lines 66-67) that is mentioned as an example of the usable dielectric material.

In short, although Mahoney mentions "thermistor materials" in column 3 at lines 12-15, these are materials for the thermistor element 10, not for the "ceramic material having a higher specific resistance" of claim 16 herein (now incorporated into claim 13). By contrast, amended claim 13 herein specifically says what substances must be contained and this requirement is different from what Mahoney describes. In other words, Mahoney, even if considered in combination with the other cited references, cannot predicate the Examiner's rejection.

In summary, it is believed that the present Amendment is totally responsive to the Office Action and hence that the application is now in condition for allowance.

As stated above, applicant is submitting herewith a sheet of formal drawings as a

replacement for the informal drawings that were earlier submitted.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Keiichi Nishimura  
Registration No. 29,093

April 24, 2006  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP  
500 12th Street, Suite 200  
Oakland, California 94607  
Telephone: (510) 663-1100  
Telefax: (510) 663-0920